MAY DAY ISSUE

LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR - R. PALME DUTT

The Fight for Peace

MAY 1950 Price: One Shilling

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PEACE BATTLEFIELDS

CELEBRATING May Day this year most of us will have in the forefront of our minds the struggle for peace which is of the very spirit of May Day. And what a tremendous over-powering strength we represent on May Day! For us at *Labour Monthly*, who have such rich links here and abroad, we shall have fresh in mind those overseas friends from whom we have heard so much in the last days and weeks. It was, for example, a very special delight when letters began to arrive from China—and pictures too, of which a first taste appears on pages 216 and 217. Then a message from friends on the other side of the world in Peru, 'we who have nothing but our enthusiasm and labour force'; a group writing from a Fascist concentration camp, as 'a mark of gratitude, sympathy and admiration for the brilliant *Labour Monthly* from us, who have been imprisoned here since 1936'; from Canada, just to tell us 'how much we appreciate the magazine'; letters from Japan, Australia, New Zealand; one Dominion reader who came in person (and left behind some crinkly bank notes). And those, too, who write from the United States, striking a note of shock and horror at finding how fiercely they have to begin to struggle 'simply for the ordinary democratic rights we always thought guaranteed by our constitution. Americans are being blinded and driven down this bad road by having all their deepest beliefs twisted and perverted into the cause of war and fascism. Those of us in the battle have to be prepared to pay a price'. Yes; there is more than one battlefield in the world from which evidence reaches us of how stiff that price can be. We remember them all on May Day; for we have friends and fellow fighters for peace in every country. To quote an English reader who wrote to praise our new *Cartoons from Abroad*, particularly those from Hungary's *Ludas Matyi*, 'Your quotations from letters from U.S.A. and Canada are very refreshing. Sometimes listening to their "lie factories" we are apt to forget that there is a working class there too and sooner or later they are going to have their say. Well, *Labour Monthly* there as everywhere is helping it to be sooner'. As I write I have before me a four-language folder which we prepared for the recent Leipzig Trade Exhibition. There it is, in English, French, German and Russian—a simple statement of what this all adds up to: A Magazine of International Labour.

WANTED: OUR OLD PAMPHLETS

During the first 29 years *Labour Monthly* has published over 40 pamphlets, many being expanded reprints of particularly striking articles. Most of these, in that form, are of course long since out of print. I am anxious to complete a few sets for the Editorial Library and wonder whether readers could help? In the 'twenties, for example, we published a group which included: *Problems of the Labour Movement*, by P. Braun; *The Burning Question of International Unity*, by A. A. Purcell; *The Diplomacy of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald*, by 'U.D.C.'; and *Face-Pidgeon: The Chinese Struggle*, by Tien Sen-Shiao. Then there was also the interesting Marxism Today series be-

Continued on inside back cover.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXII, No. 5

CONTENTS

May, 1950

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: May Day, 1950, by R.P.D.	193
THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE: by Arthur Horner	202
THE MALAYA WAR: by H. B. Lim	210
SEEK PEACE FIRST: by Ilya Ehrenburg	219
PORTRAIT OF A RENEGADE: by Palmiro Togliatti	225
MILITARISM AND YOUTH: by Walter Davis	232
CARTOON FROM ABROAD	216 & 217
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO	231
Book Reviews:	
The Diplomat, by James Aldridge: *Douglas Goldring*	235
Hitler as War Lord, by Franz Halder: *James Klugmann*	236
Cultura y Democracia: *L. Elliott*	237
The Ship of State, by Edward Jenks; The British Approach to Politics, by Michael Stewart; The English Parliament, by Kenneth Mackenzie: *R. Malcolm*	238
India Today, by R. Palme Dutt: *Lester Hutchinson*	240
Politics, Trials and Errors, by Lord Hankey: *L.E.*	240

Notes of the Month

May Day, 1950

FIVE years ago the war ended. On this May Day, 1950, it is timely to look before and after, to see the road that we have travelled and the prospect before us. These five years have seen great events and victories. They have seen a more extensive advance of liberation over gigantic areas of the world, from Berlin to Shanghai, from the German Democratic Republic in the West to the Chinese People's Republic in the Far East, and a greater extension of working class leadership and establishment of the foundations of socialism, than at any time since 1917. The classic contrast of the Weimar Republic, steered by Social-democracy to shipwreck and Fascism, and of the Soviet Union, advancing under Communist leadership to the victory of socialism, after the first world war, has been repeated in new forms after the second world war in the contrast of the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe and Labour Britain. The People's Democracies after five years are able to celebrate the complete wiping out of all forms of landlord and capitalist exploitation, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

triumphant sweep forward of socialist industry and extending co-operation in agriculture to ever rising standards, and the indestructible consolidation of the power and unity of the working people. Labour Britain has staggered from crisis to crisis, and from expedient to expedient, to economy cuts and worsened standards, the strengthened entrenchment of monopoly capitalism, and the revival of Toryism. As the contrast between the old world and the new world grows greater, the old world moves ever more feverishly, and with even more crazy and total concentration than in the era of fascism, to the scheming of war as the grand solution and the last gambler's throw. Military pact succeeds military pact in the toppling edifice of Western imperialist power-blocs. But the peace front of the peoples grows even more rapidly in opposition to the schemes of war. The issue of peace or war hangs in the balance. This is the tense point which has now been reached five years after victory over fascism. The fight for peace dominates this May Day, 1950, for every country in the world.

A Warning For Today

Five years ago, on May 9, 1945, Stalin proclaimed:

> Henceforth the great banner of the people's freedom and of peace among the peoples will fly over Europe.
>
> Three years ago Hitler stated publicly that his plans included the carving up of the Soviet Union and depriving it of the Caucasus, the Ukraine, White Russia, the Baltics and other regions. He stated directly: 'We shall destroy Russia so that she will never be able to rise again'. But Hitler's insane ideas were doomed to be falsified. They were blown to dust during the war. In fact, the exact opposite happened to what the Hitlerites threatened. Germany is completely smashed. The German troops are capitulating. The Soviet Union is rejoicing in its victory, although it does not intend either to exterminate or to destroy Germany.

Yet after only five years the same lunatic dreams are proclaimed today again by the New Hitlerites of the Anglo-American Alliance. The Anti-Comintern Pact has been dubbed anew the Atlantic Pact. The General Staff plans are mapped out with microscopic detail to 'wipe out every city, town and village in Russia' (in the words of George Earle, U.S. envoy in Europe, already in 1946). The Conservative Election Programme publicly announces the war aim of the re-establishment of capitalism in Eastern Europe. The American High Command, after sending out their reconnaissance bomber over Soviet Latvia, publicly defend their action by declaring that they have never recognised the Latvian Soviet Republic as part of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Union. The lesson of 1945 has not yet been learned. The fate of the old Hitlerites should be a warning to their new disciples. And indeed their present solicitude to rehabilitate the War Criminals, and to celebrate with lavish publicity the Rommels and Skorzenys, suggests that they are already watching out with an anxious eye for the day when they may themselves be in the dock.

Back to the Old Vomit

Within five years the voice of Thomas Mann sounds the warning that Hitlerism is being rebuilt in Western Germany by the Western Powers. According to a Reuter report from America on April 14:

> Thomas Mann, anti-Nazi German novelist and Nobel prizewinner, today declared that Hitlerism was rising again in Germany because the West thought that the threat from the East could best be answered by the forces of Nationalism, Nazism and Anti-Semitism.
>
> He said that to 'abet Fascism' in Germany must endanger freedom and democracy at home. Growing Anti-Semitism in America was a symptom of this. 'Humanity as a whole', he said, 'has ample reason to dread the turn which developments in Germany have taken once more.
>
> 'The old powers, seemingly vanquished in 1945, would not have regained so much of their former influence in Germany had it not been for our notion that the threat from the East could best be met with the help of precisely these forces—an erroneous notion which unless swiftly corrected will cost us dearly'.

When a Churchill spreads the cry for the rearmament of German reaction and its unification with de Gaulle fascism in France, it is time for the British and French peoples to awaken to the peril of the path along which their rulers are seeking to take them. This is the road which led to the second world war. If it is not to lead to a third world war, the fight for peace will have to be intensified above all in Britain and America against the policy of our present rulers.

Testament of Quisling

When the traitor Quisling was placed on trial in Norway in August, 1945, he was asked to define his conception of the 'Great Germanic Community' which he advocated as the aim of Hitlerism. His reply may be recommended to the Churchills and the Schumanns, the Achesons and the Bevins today:

> The Judge asked what he meant by the 'Great Germanic Community'. Quisling replied: 'A corporation of the Nordic Scandinavian States with all other Germanic peoples—that is, Germany, Great Britain, France and the United States'. (*The Times*, August 23, 1945).

The United States, Britain, France, Germany and the Scandinavian countries. But what else is the Atlantic Pact? The Atlantic Pact is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the fulfilment of the dream of Quisling. The Atlantic Pact is the fulfilment of the dream of Hitlerism. In vain the sponsors of the Atlantic Pact seek to deceive the peoples by proclaiming that it is ' only for defence ' against the ' menace of Communism ' and ' Soviet aggression '. This is the self-same language that was used by the sponsors of the Anti-Comintern Pact to describe their war alliance.

Into the Morass

At the Hague in April, 1950, the military ' Plan of Campaign ' has been drawn up and signed by the Defence Ministers of the Atlantic Powers. The secret military commitments of the Atlantic Pact are being fastened upon the British people and the peoples of Western Europe. The American militarists are pouring the weapons of destruction into Europe for a new bloodbath. They are demanding that armaments must be raised and raised again. House-building is cut to three-fifths pre-war, subsidies and controls are successively lifted, the price of food and the necessities of life is continuously raised, as the shoddy ' Welfare State ' sinks into a morass of militarism. To cover this foul progeny of Quisling and Hitlerism, Schumann proposes that the Atlantic Pact Council shall be dubbed the ' Council of Peace '. Hypocrisy is the homage of the warmongers to the Peace Movement. They are prepared to twist words to strange uses. They have twisted ' democracy ' to cover the colour-bar, colonial slavery and the bombing of villages in Malaya. Now they would seek to twist ' peace ' to cover atomic barbarism and the extermination of humanity.

Two Paths

Two paths led from the victory of 1945. One path led forward to the destruction of fascism and its basis in reaction and monopoly, to the freedom and co-operation of all nations for the maintenance of peace, to the unity and strength of the working people advancing along the road to socialism. The other path led to the rebuilding of fascist reaction, the disruption of the wartime alliance and repudiation of the engagements pledged during the war, the return to the old anti-Soviet and anti-Communist hysteria of the Munich era, the protection of capitalist monopoly and imperialist aggression, the division of the working class, the shattering of the foundations of peace and preparation of a new world war. Along the first path the peoples of the countries of Europe sought to go forward, and were only held back where direct imperialist intervention from outside, as in France, Italy and Greece, blocked the path. It is the tragedy of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain during these five years since the war that, whereas by their electoral vote of 1945 the people showed their desire to break with Toryism and the Tory pro-fascist anti-Soviet path of disaster, they have been led by a Labour Government along that selfsame path, and have even been made the instruments to disrupt the unity of the international working class, to violate the liberty of other nations, as in Greece and Malaya, and to act as the spearhead of the American war offensive in Europe. From this follow all the home difficulties which have wrecked the hopes of social reconstruction.

Tory Dreams Fulfilled

Already from the moment of the change of Government in 1945, when the popular vote had defeated the aims of a Tory or Coalition Government, Toryism and the leadership of British finance-capital openly placed their hopes on a Right-Wing Labour Government to fulfil this rôle. The *Observer* of August 5, 1945, calculated that a Labour Government could more effectively pursue an anti-Soviet policy than a Tory Government. Mr. Bevin, its editorial commented,

> taking Mr. Eden's place, will have no enviable task, but it may be an advantage for him to be able to speak frankly to Russia without being suspected of Tory prejudice.

Similarly the *Economist* of August 4, 1945, noted that a Tory Government would have a ' natural difficulty ' in coming out too openly against the Soviet Union:

> Any standing up to the Russians by Tories, however necessary, is immediately suspect at home and attacked by the Opposition.

On the other hand, a Labour Government would have no such limitation in pursuing an anti-Soviet policy:

> It can indulge in firm negotiations without having its coat tails pulled by the Opposition at home.

These calculations of British reaction were amply fulfilled by the Labour Government. In response to these openly expressed aspirations, Mr. Bevin appeared as the Answer to the Tory's Prayer.

Betrayal of Peace

When the attempt is now made to trade on the shortness of the public memory, and to paint a mythical picture suggesting that the Labour Government entered into office bursting with friendliness to the Soviet Union and desire for British-Soviet co-operation, only to be repulsed by the unco-operative attitude of Soviet leaders and forced reluctantly at long last to accept the Churchill Fulton programme, the facts prove the opposite. Already the first speech of Bevin as Foreign Secretary in August, 1945, beat the anti-Soviet

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drum, denounced the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe, and proclaimed the aim of his policy to defeat the advance of Communism in Europe (' to prevent the substitution of one form of totalitarianism by another '). The notorious Hearst press of America acclaimed Bevin's speech of August, 1945, under the title: ' Bevin Talk Buoys Anti-Soviet Bloc '; and the article by the no less notorious Karl von Wiegand proclaimed:

> Bevin's commonsense speech has given new impetus to hopes and thoughts of creating a Western democratic bloc in Europe.

Not only the Tory press, but equally the Labour and Social-Democratic press of Western Europe, in a spate of articles of Laski, Blum and others, was calling for a Western Bloc to counterpose to the Soviet Union. Already by November, 1945, the Labour organ was denouncing and repudiating the wartime agreements of Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam for Anglo-American-Soviet co-operation as worthless scraps of paper:

> The air is cleared. . . Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam are shown up for what they were worth, which was nothing much.
>
> (*Daily Herald*, November 9, 1945.)

It was Anglo-American policy which deliberately broke the basis of post-war co-operation for the maintenance of peace, chose the path of the division of the world into two camps, openly speculated on a third world war even before the second world war was over, and proclaimed the strategy of the ' cold war ' (the phrase was coined by American publicists) as the preliminary preparation for the third world war, the full programme for which was set out in Churchill's Fulton speech by the spring of 1946.

Military Dilemmas

For five years this war policy has dominated all the activities of the Western Powers and bedevilled their internal politics. The fever is still climbing higher. But today after five years the fiascos and bankruptcies of this war policy resound on every side. Collapse of the illusion of atomic monopoly, on which the entire strategy of aggression was based. Collapse in the Far East. Collapse of economic ' recovery '. Military dilemmas haunt the war planners. Anglo-French reaction signed the Atlantic Pact in the expectation that this would mean vast American forces in Europe to sustain the sinking capitalist order. American reaction promoted the Atlantic Pact in order to utilise Anglo-French troops to do the dirty work. When the staff chiefs meet, the mutual double-cross is revealed. The troops are not there. Fontainebleau proliferates sub-committees and files. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brass-hatted mice engender mountains of paper plans. Shall it be twenty, thirty, or fifty divisions for a start? But the troops are not there. Already the war in Viet-Nam bleeds France white. Already the war in Malaya absorbs the available British mobile forces, not to mention Gurkhas, ex-stormtroopers and head hunters. War Lord Strachey complains that he has only 185,000 Regulars, and that the number is likely to drop further owing to the recruiting fiasco, when the plans and commitments require 350,000 at once. The collapse in recruiting is described as especially calamitous during recent months. The people are voting with their feet. They do not want war.

Counsels of Desperation

Does this fiasco of the war plans and of their 'cold war' mean that the war danger is diminished? On the contrary, it means that the war danger is increased. Every year, every month of peace brings out more inexorably the rising strength and accelerating economic and social advance of the socialist world and of the countries of popular democracy advancing to socialism. Their prices fall and standards rise as regularly as prices rise and standards fall within the capitalist countries. The leaders of capitalism cannot face this prospect. Peace for them spells doom and the triumph of Communism. General Eisenhower at the end of March screams for a preventive war:

> Far better risk a war of possible annihilation than grasp a peace which would be the certain annihilation of free man's ideas and ideals.

Bevin, in his controversy with Churchill over the timing and method of German rearmament, blurts out that the Fulton programme is the programme of a 'preventive war':

> As I understood the Fulton speech, it was a preventive war Mr. Churchill had in mind.
>
> (Ernest Bevin, House of Commons, March 28, 1950.)

But the Government in previous debates has publicly accepted the Fulton programme. The doctrine of the 'preventive war' (Hitler's favourite doctrine) now stalks into public view. The aggressors unmask.

Tactics of Gangsterism

Therefore the danger of war and the fight for peace now reach extreme tension. The more relentlessly the balance of the scales turns in favour of the camp of peace, the more violent and reckless become the tactics of the war planners. This is seen in the advance to methods of open gangsterism by the American imperialist forces in Europe, the violent diversion of Czech planes and kidnapping of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Czech citizens into Germany, or the sending of the armed bomber plane into Soviet territory and opening of fire against the Soviet frontier guard planes. It is seen no less in the clamorous demand for the rearming of Nazism. The Service debates which dominated the first weeks of this new reactionary parliament were a study in war hysteria. Do the troops already available, with expenditure three times pre-war and numbers double pre-war, with peacetime conscription of 18 months, prove insufficient to meet the extending commitments? Suggestions for enlargement pour out. Form a Foreign Legion. Organise a Colonial Army. Organise an African Army. Recruit the ex-Nazis and war criminals. All means are holy for the Holy War of the new Holy Alliance in the Pope's Holy Year.

Rearming Nazism

So the cry for rearming German reaction sounds anew from the Big Shot gangster-hirers of Wall Street and the City, as in the years between the wars, when they armed Hitler. The imperialist anthem 'Deutschland Ueber Alles' sounds again in the halls of Western Berlin to greet 'Federal Chancellor' Adenauer in the presence of the High Commissioners of the Western Powers. Churchill, apostle of 'unconditional surrender', leads the van in the call for German Rearmament. But the Foreign Office, through its mouthpiece Bevin, moves more cautiously. They fear the repercussions in France, where all the whitewash of a venal press in the service of Marshall cannot so quickly wipe out the memories of Nazi occupation, and mass opinion rallies to the Communist Party as the only party of the nation. They remember how the gun back-fired when they rearmed Hitler, and they know that nothing has changed in the aggressive aims of German imperialism and militarism, despite defeat. 'Germany may lose a war, but she never loses a peace', proclaimed the Nazi General Faupel as the new slogan from South America in the hour of military collapse. The American militarists have reason to remember what happened to the billions of dollars worth of arms they poured out to Chiang Kai-shek. Hence the cross-purposes on Nazi Rearmament.

'Act Now' Hysterics

The American militarists ship their arms to Europe, but they make sure that the arms they ship are of an out-of-date pattern, and they take care to keep to themselves their precious atom bombs, which they will not entrust even to their most obsequious British and French cronies. There is no honour among thieves. The contradic-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions rise in the camp of reaction. But at the same time the din of war preparation rises, and the frenzied clamour for instant war 'before it is too late'. In the words of General Howley, U.S. Commander-in-Chief in Berlin, on February 6, 1950:

> Now we have got a head start with the hydrogen bomb, we should lay down the law—not as diplomats, but as soldiers. We have got to act while we have the advantage.

Hitler never spoke plainer. We may safely offer a £10,000 prize to the Editors of the *Daily Herald, Daily Mail, Daily Express, News Chronicle* or any other war organ, or any reader, if they can produce a one hundredth part comparable bellicose utterance from any Soviet general.

The Fight for Peace in Britain

That is why at the present moment the fight for peace must rise to a strength and intensity never before equalled. And it is above all in Britain that the fight for peace must be waged; for Britain is the key centre and base of the American war plans in Europe. The peace movement in Britain has lagged behind, because there is not yet realisation among the masses of the people how grave and intense is the danger of a new aggressive war, or to what a pitch the war preparations, war alliances and war commitments have already been carried. The aggressive war preparations are still hidden behind hypocritical talk of 'defence'. The full-scale war in Malaya is still hidden behind Japanese phraseology of a 'police operation' against 'bandits'. The peace movement in Britain has lagged behind, because there is not yet understanding of the integral connection of Britain's economic difficulties, mass hardships and economy cuts with the war policy. The fight for living standards is still seen in a separate compartment from the fight for peace.The old Hitlerite boasts of 'full employment' under capitalism are repeated without recognition of its parallel basis in frenzied rearmament and war inflation. 'Of course we can always save if we cut defence', declares Cripps in his Budget speech, 'leaving ourselves undefended'. Is it 'defence' to bomb villages in Malaya? Is it 'defence' to spend in 1949 alone £164 million on overseas military expenditure, or more than double the deficit on the balance of payments? The fight for living standards is an indispensable part of the fight for peace. The fight for peace is today in this present situation the central all-embracing political task for the whole working class movement and the whole people in Britain, decisive for the entire future—the campaign to which this May Day, 1950, calls us all.

April 19, 1950. R.P.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

ARTHUR L. HORNER

SIXTY years ago the first May Day demonstration was held in Hyde Park in London. Sixty years ago in every advanced capitalist country the workers gathered in First of May demonstrations. The decision the previous year of the First Congress of the Socialist International had been that ' There shall be organised a great international demonstration at a fixed date on the same agreed day in every country and in every town '. As the years went on, the First of May demonstration, held to begin with in North America and in Europe, spread until twenty-five years ago it was being held in China and in India, until in every continent the workers were demonstrating. Wherever in the second half of that stretch of sixty years the workers have come to power, May Day has become the greatest international festival. But May Day, according to these decisions of sixty years ago, is a festival only after the working class has won power, until then it is a day of united struggle against capitalist oppression and imperialist war. The fight against war, like the fight for shorter hours, and especially for the eight-hour day, was in the forefront of the demonstration sixty years ago. When the Second Congress of the Socialist International met at Brussels in 1891, there stood on its agenda a Report on May Day which stressed the principle of The Eight-Hour Day and Labour Legislation, and ' the world-wide declaration by the proletariat for the maintenance of peace between nations '.

In those days of sixty years ago, the trade union movement in this country was much smaller than it is now, and the general labour unions were only beginning the course of organisation which has made them nearly half the total number of organised workers. The Miners' Federation of Great Britain, joining together the Colliers' County Associations into a larger body, had only come into being six months before that first May Day. Other trade unions now powerful were only at their first beginnings. But, whether the working class bodies of those days were these infant unions, or the older-established craft societies, they threw themselves into the May Day demonstrations with an ardent faith in the unity of the working class that could bring about the eight-hour day, labour legislation, and above all the maintenance of peace. Today, the whole working class movement has grown incomparably greater in numbers. There are six times as many trade unionists in Britain today as there were in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1890. All the more reason then that on this great sixtieth anniversary of a day which is still in the memory of a few surviving veterans we should see how far we have been able to attain the aims then put forward by our fathers and our grandfathers. One aim we have achieved. The eight-hour day. Even though the intensity of labour has been made so much greater, so that the toil per man-hour as well as the output have greatly increased, we should nevertheless rejoice in the achievement of eight hours, and in many cases, less than eight hours. Labour legislation, too, even if not in the form our forefathers looked for, we have nevertheless achieved. For example, they wanted Old Age Pensions and pensions of all kinds to be non-contributory—as they are in the Soviet Union and in the Peoples' Democracies; in Britain there is still some way for us to go.

But in one thing the growing strength of the trade union and working class movement has been unable to carry out its aims; the maintenance of peace in these sixty years was not achieved. The rulers of this country were able to carry on in the early 'nineties Colonial wars, wars against the colonial peoples that have gone on ever since. They were able to carry on imperialist wars, such as the South African war of 1899—1902, which gave a dreadful example for other imperialist powers to follow. Finally, mankind, despite all efforts of the working class, has been twice plunged into world wars that made the first half of the twentieth century the bloodiest for a thousand years in the history of mankind. This thought alone should give us pause, should make us look backward in shame at the failure to achieve the aims of the first May Day and should stir every one of us to a deep resolve that henceforward we shall fight for peace as never before and lift the shadow that lies on the path of the young generation.

The situation is tenser than after the First World War. Five years after the Peace Treaty of Versailles negotiations in 1919 there was a certain small scaling down of armaments and a temporary lull. But scarcely was the Second World War ended than the warmongers were busy and the preparations for new war had begun. Five years have gone by since 1945 and there is as yet no peace treaty with Germany, Japan, Austria. Instead of peace, colonial wars are being waged in Malaya, Viet-Nam and elsewhere. Instead of peace on a world scale the cold war (a phrase invented by the Yankees) has turned Britain into a limbo of dread expectancy. Conscription has been imposed and, with the additional compulsory four years in the territorials, the militarisation of this country grows greater and greater. Economics and politics are bound up together and both are harnessed to the chariot of war preparations. The Tru-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man doctrine of March, 1947, is bound up with the Marshall Plan announced in June, 1947, nor can the two be separated. The Yankee war-mongers and the Yankee money-lenders are one and the same firm. The nations whose governments accepted the Marshall Plan, accepted at the same time the Truman doctrine of hostility towards workers and peasants in any country advancing towards socialism, and the first fruits of the Truman doctrine in the Brussels Pact of March, 1948, and subsequent Atlantic Pact which binds Britain and its other signatories to wage war whenever Wall Street's Government at Washington so decides. Indeed, after the signature of the Brussels Pact, with its schemes of Western Union defence (and the widely advertised talk of Western Christian civilisation ' in danger ') there was a risk during the ten months of the Berlin air-lift that the cold war might turn into what the Yankees called a ' shooting ' war. This danger was lessened for the time being by the agreement at Paris last June which ended the Berlin air-lift and raised hopes that with some people turned into illusions that the war danger was past.

What is the condition of this cold war strategy of the U.S.A. and its satellites in the last nine months? In the first place it has to be realised that U.S.A. strategy suffered a two-fold defeat in 1949. The first was the overthrow of the Yankee puppet Chiang Kai-shek in China and the liberation of nearly a fifth of mankind, to be followed in March of this year by the firm treaty of friendship and mutual help between the U.S.S.R. and the New China. Seldom in history has a great capitalist power suffered such a sudden and overwhelming defeat as that which overtook Yankee imperialism in the Far East in 1948-49. Acheson's nose is still bleeding and that is the only meaning of his recent drip of plaintive and snarling speeches. The other defeat was the announcement simultaneously from Washington, Ottawa and London of their recognition that the Soviet Union possessed the atomic weapon. If it was the victory of the New China and the pressure of the peace forces throughout the world that brought about the Paris agreement in June of last year, then the recognition of the atomic weapon as held also by the U.S.S.R. seemed to remove one basis of the cold war. For the cold war had been based, not so much on the maniacal hatred of socialism and Communism by the Yankee millionaires (that had always existed), but in their sudden hallucination that their monopoly possession of atomic weapons enabled them to bend the whole world to their will. It was cold war strategy. It was atom bomb diplomacy. The speech of Churchill at Fulton, Missouri, in February, 1946, was based on the possession by the U.S.A. of the atom bomb. And with all his sycophancy to the Yankees, Churchill would hardly have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gone so far in his willingness to subordinate British interests to those of American imperialism had it not been for the atom bomb..

Why, then, has the cold war continued? Why, when the danger of outbreak of war appeared for a few weeks last summer to be less immediate, did the imperialists continue their piling up of arms and their war preparations on such a monstrous scale that in every budget ' Defence ' is swallowing up more and more of the available resources in treasure and in manpower? In the United States of America there was both an internal and an external reason for this. The internal reason was that by throwing thousands of millions of dollars into the maw of the armament firms (including the monopolies that make atomic bombs) they both enabled the profits of these firms to reach unexampled high levels and at the same time sought to stave off the gathering economic crisis. Nothing that capitalist statesmen have ever attempted can stop the onset of crisis which is inherent in the capitalist system. But for a certain time the impact of mass unemployment can be lessened by the use of manpower in an inflated armaments industry. This was the trick discovered by Hitler. The Yankee millionaires have picked up that trick, and it is certain that their four-and-a-half-million unemployed or their fifteen million partly employed would reach a much greater figure but for their monstrous expenditure on arms—luxury spending on the most infernal of luxuries.

The external reason is that the socialist countries and the countries of people's democracy who have no wish for war must nevertheless have regard in the face of the threats of the warmongers to the needs of their own security. Therefore, the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies, longing to devote all their resources to the peaceful construction of socialism, are compelled to divert a proportion of their resources (small in comparison to the imperialists' war budgets, but nevertheless a definite proportion) to maintaining their armed forces in readiness against unprovoked attack. Thus, the monstrous arms expenditure of imperialist powers at once swells the coffers of the millionaires and lessens the resources that would otherwise be made available for the construction of socialism. It is a good game for the millionaires, but a losing game for the people of the United States.

But to us also in this country it is a losing game. With our swollen armaments amounting to well-nigh £800,000,000 this year, we are to that same extent deprived of the houses, schools, hospitals and other social services which should be ours, and of the increased wages and pensions that are badly needed to meet the rise in the cost of living. With this piling up of armaments, with the increasing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subjection of British interests to the demands of the Yankee imperialists, with the arrival of the B.29 squadrons that turn this island into an advance base (and highly vulnerable at that) for the U.S. atom bombers, the menace of war has grown greater again in these last months. Instead of seeking for peace, the opposite step was taken by the U.S. Government when at the end of January President Truman ordered the preparation of still more destructive types of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen-bomb. The maniac millionaires of Wall Street will stop at nothing, it seems, in their endeavour to plunge the nations into a third world war.

It is the duty of every trade unionist, of every member of the working-class movement to do his or her utmost to call a halt to this madness and to join actively in the struggle of the forces of peace.

The forces of peace on a world scale are not small. In their greatest amplitude they cover that 800 millions of mankind from Poland and Czechoslovakia to the China Sea that have turned their steps resolutely on the path to socialism, together with the many millions elsewhere that hate war and seek for peace. In addition there was formed just over a year ago the World Peace Committee whose World Congress at Paris last June was followed by national conferences, in Moscow in August, in London in October. By the time the Second World Peace Congress is held in Italy some six months hence, there will be many more millions on the alert and ready to respond to the call sent out in mid-March by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its Stockholm Meeting:

> We address the proposal to all people of good will to appoint representatives to the Second World Peace Congress which will be held in the fourth quarter of 1950 in Italy. We appeal to all social and religious groups, to all workers in culture and to all honest people who, regardless of their opinions as to the reasons for the present tense international situation, are alarmed about it and seriously wish to re-establish peaceful relations among the nations. As the basis for agreement we propose the prohibition of the atomic weapon and condemnation of the Government which is the first to use the atomic weapon.

It is as part of this world-wide movement that the British Peace Committee is going to hold its British Peace Campaign Conference in July with mass demonstrations this month and next and is launching its National Petition to Parliament. As is known, the two main demands of this British Peace Campaign at this time in Britain are:—

1. The prohibition of the Atom Bomb with international control and inspection;
2. The reduction in armaments, and to urge the Government to convene

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a meeting of the Five Great Powers to obtain their approval for these aims.

In many of the most important countries of the world, the trade unions, true to the traditions of the proletarian struggle for peace, are supporting the World Peace Committee with might and main. In contrast to the official trade union bodies of the United States and of Britain, the World Federation of Trade Unions which was formed as a result of a decision of the British Trade Union Congress seven years ago, but from which the British Trade Union Congress, egged on to it by the Yankees, seceded seventeen months ago, had from the beginning put the struggle for the maintenance of peace between nations in the forefront of its policy. So soon as the World Peace Committee had come into being, the World Federation of Trade Unions at its Second World Trade Union Congress held in Milan in July of last year, unanimously endorsed the attitude of the World Peace Committee. Moreover, they uttered the appeal to all workers by hand and brain:—

> To develop widespread action in favour of the defence of Peace, to draw up a concrete programme for this action, within the grasp of the broad masses of the workers, and to unite without distinction of race, religion or opinion to achieve the triumph of this programme; where circumstances permit to form committees for the defence of peace in factories and offices and bring into their ranks all workers by hand and brain.

Not only these official trade union bodies supported the struggle for peace, but very many trade unionists personally by their activity in their place of work, took an active part in the struggle. The French dockers, who struck to prevent the import of U.S.A. armaments into France, armaments which were to be used for the purpose immediately of war upon the people of Viet-Nam in Indo-China, or later for the purpose of war upon the workers and peasants of Eastern Europe, were taking the same kind of action as those dockers who in the Port of London in 1920 struck against loading munitions (for use against the U.S.S.R.) onto the s.s. Jolly George—with the approval at that time of Ernest Bevin.

In face of all this activity, of trade unions and trade unionists, in other countries, on behalf of the cause of peace, the question naturally arises as to why it is that so few of the official trade union bodies in this country as yet have moved strongly for action to maintain peace between the nations. Why has so little been done by so many?

In the first place, the answer is *not* that British trade unionists desire war: let that be said at once. In the second place, to answer the question fully would take a volume, and would bring in the whole history of the working class movement in this century and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the development of monopoly capitalism in the same period. But to give a partial answer is possible. Perhaps if I recall something of my own experience, it may help towards an explanation.

Before the first world war, in the coalfields, and certainly in the mining valleys of South Wales, there were always some who were trying to carry out the First of May principle of the working-class struggle to maintain peace between the nations. Keir Hardie, then Member for Merthyr Tydvil, was one of those who carried on that fight. As a boy, I used to go and hear him at those meetings. Then later, as I grew up, I began to take an active part in the agitations, not only for better wages, shorter hours and improvement of conditions, but for the ending of capitalism, and the prevention of wars that spring from capitalism. When the first world war broke out suddenly in August, 1914, the torrent of jingoism swept nearly everything before it. Keir Hardie died of a broken heart at the betrayal of all his hopes for socialism and peace. But in the valleys there were a minority of us, as there were in the other coalfields and throughout the towns of Great Britain, who took up an anti-militarist stand and kept struggling against the capitalist war and did our utmost to bring it to an end. The capitalist rulers of Britain knew us for their enemies. I was a very young man then, but I too, along with many others, was threatened with imprisonment and latterly was sent to jail. That struggle was not in vain. It was carried on for years and months before the Russian Revolution, and indeed was a continuation of the struggle that had gone on from the first May Day of 1890 and from even further back. It may partly be put to the credit of that struggle that in 1920, six years after 1914, when a capitalist government again wanted to go to war, this time against the U.S.S.R., the organised workers through their trade union bodies forming Councils of Action effectively called a halt to that war.

The fact is that the organised working class was not strong enough to prevent the First World War. Twenty-five years later, had it only been more united, the Second World War might have been prevented. It is certain that the organised working class today is now strong enough to prevent a Third World War—provided it has the will to act.

'Provided it has the will to act'. That is the proviso that is now thoroughly understood by the handful of rich men who pull the strings in capitalist countries. Hitler also understood this and therefore took care to suppress the trade unions, the political parties, and other organisations of the working class before he launched his

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aggressions. The capitalists were not above taking lessons from Hitler, and just as Churchill took over some of the Nazi phraseology when he gave currency to the false coinage of the 'Iron Curtain', so the capitalists realised that they could not go forward with plans for a third world war without crippling the organisations of the working class or sapping their will to act in the cause of peace.

This alone is reason enough for the torrent of propaganda that has been poured forth from every capitalist agency in the last four years and more. By every possible means, newspaper press (twenty-five million copies daily of newspapers nearly all owned by millionaires), wireless, and television (a monopoly which now slavishly serves up as news the mainly propaganda hand-outs of minor officials of the Foreign Office), Church of England (headed now by an Archbishop who is as much below the Canterbury average as his predecessor Temple was above it), the Church of Rome (whose hierarchy of bishops openly act as the agents of a foreign power to which ambassadors are sent in the Vatican City) and finally the Yankee dominated films, propaganda comes for war against Russia (that is the only country which has got rid of all the capitalists and landlords) and against the cause of peace. How many of my readers have ever heard mention in any of these cultural agencies of the activities of the British Peace Committee or of the great Paris Congress less than a year ago, where the demonstration meeting was attended by the unprecedented figure of half a million (500,000) men and women? On one thing they are all agreed—to suppress the truth about the fight for peace of the British Peace Committee; to hide its very existence from the millions of trade unionists in this country. By falsehood served up as the daily food of the people and with essential facts suppressed, they hope to enfeeble the will to act in the cause of peace and to break in pieces the best traditions of British trade unionism, and to wipe out the memory of the May Day of 1890 and all the May Days since then.

But to be fore-warned is to be fore-armed. Once British Trade Unionists realise what the capitalists are trying to do to their minds and wills, they are bound to resist. In the workshop and in the branch, on the railway, on the ships, in the mine and in the factory they are bound to try to stem this torrent of propaganda, to begin to make headway against this tidal wave of falsehood and to take up again 'the proletarian struggle to maintain peace between the nations'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MALAYA WAR

H. B. LIM

WHAT does the Labour Movement in Britain think of the War in Malaya? I have often been asked this question, but always I have to answer with these words: ' It is a question which the British Labour Movement must answer for itself '. I do this not to avoid an answer, but to convey in as clear and as positive a way as possible the full importance and responsibility of the British movement to understand and to take all necessary action with regard to the war in Malaya.

The war has now gone on for 20 months. All that time the Labour Movement in this country has been kept in a state of complete ignorance as to the nature and the extent of the war by the powers that be. Worse than that, ugly lies have been poured out by the capitalist press and the B.B.C. to add confusion to a situation already made dangerous by the fact that it has been deliberately obscured by the Government of this country. An analysis of the news treatment of the war in Malaya during the past 20 months shows an appalling state of disregard for every known rudimentary rule of accurate and objective reporting. First these propagandists began by characterising the war as ' a Communist uprising to seize power ' in Malaya. Next, fear that the organised political and economic struggle of the Malayan people might emerge from the characterisation of the war as ' Communist uprising to seize power ', the official propagandists soon changed their slogan to one of ' Bandit suppression ' and ' campaign against terrorism'. Then, after the first two months of the war this propaganda *volte face* became the theme, the apologia, and the propaganda tactics of the Government and those who supported the war of suppression. We cannot pretend, indeed we cannot afford to pretend, that all these have not had their effect on every section of British opinion. When 99.9 per cent. of the newspapers, together with the B.B.C., set forth to publish, repeat, and advocate such gospel of untruth, it is not surprising that many innocent and thinking people are deceived. Twenty months of subjection to this organised perfidy has caused even some sections of the Labour Movement to lean on the side of the official propagandists. Whilst not altogether succumbing to the plausible stories of ' bandit suppression ' churned out by the Government propagandists, many in the Labour Movement yet allowed themselves to be dulled into a state

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of confusion and semi-darkness which could only mean a state of irresponsibility and inactivity so far as stopping the war was concerned. Throughout this period of confusion, the *Daily Worker* has endeavoured to present a true picture of the war in Malaya against the overwhelming weight of uniform, organised misinformation published by Tory, Labour and Liberal press alike. Throughout the same period the *Malayan Monitor* sought to supply the British reading public with first-hand information from news sources close to the fighting itself. It was like guerilla fighting against massed mechanised formations. Positive results have been achieved in the struggle to bring the truth to the British people, but more remains to be done before the purveyors of slander and untruth are decisively routed.

It is heartening to note in the meantime, that the course of the war has revealed a number of facts which challenge the official propaganda most sharply. Let the following examples, coming from the mouths of British officials themselves, tell their story:

(1) Mr. Strachey stated in the House of Commons on March 20 this year ' the gravest problem in the Far East remains the situation in Malaya '. This, from a Secretary of State for War, would be a most unlikely statement to make if the situation in Malaya were, as the official propagandists had been saying, merely one of ' bandit suppression '.

(2) Lord Killearn, former British Commissioner General in South-East Asia, stated in the House of Lords, April 5 this year, ' I have just returned from Malaya . . . the situation is very bad. In the past, we have talked about these people as bandits. I ask whether their character has not changed: whether it is not really guerilla warfare. I believe myself it has. We knew they were fully organised . . . in battalions and companies and very ably directed. They were served by a large number of others not in uniform. Their intelligence service is extremely good—personally I suspect it is better than ours '. Lord Killearn's admission, like Mr. Strachey's, is an exposure of the official slanders about ' banditry ', ' terrorism ', etc., and is also an acknowledgment of a highly organised, widely supported movement for national liberation.

(3) Mr. J. Griffiths, Secretary of State for the Colonies, revealed in the House of Commons on April 7 this year that a total of 70,000 police, and 11,000 ground forces (military) have been operating against the ' bandits '. Added to these, he announced, there would be a reinforcement of 2,000 Gurkhas. We have, therefore, the British official figure of 83,000 patrol, mechanised, and garrison forces, with-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out reckoning the several squadrons (bomber and fighter) of the R.A.F., and the Naval units operating in co-ordination with the ground forces. If we add to these the total number of estate armed units, armed informers, and local ' defence ' forces, we find approximately 130,000 personnel in the services of the imperialists. The story of ' bandit suppression ' falls to the ground when challenged by the figures quoted above. These figures represent the heaviest concentration of foreign troops per head of local population in the entire theatres of war in South-East Asia.

(4) In March this year, the 20th Squadron of the R.A.F. (Lincoln Bombers) was hastened to the scene of fighting as added reinforcement to the already heavy concentration of British imperial forces.

(5) On April 19 this year, the Malayan Legislative Council formally tabled a motion requesting Whitehall for a further increase British imperial forces and armaments.

All these leave no room for doubt that what has gone on in Malaya for the past 20 months has been a full-scale, heavily armed warfare, carried out by the British Government against a force that far transcends anything which the deliberately misleading words ' banditry ' and ' terrorism ' imply. This force is the Malayan People's Liberation Army. And the fact that this army has not only survived the mass attacks launched by the British imperial army for 20 months, but has even sharpened its counter-attacks to the point of creating the ' gravest problem in the Far East ', as described by Mr. Strachey, proves emphatically that it is an Army that is powerfully supported by the people. Anyone with even an elementary knowledge of guerilla fighting can see that no guerilla warfare can survive, let alone seize the initiative, otherwise.

Britain's war in Malaya is, therefore, a war against the National Liberation Movement of the Malayan people. This is the fundamental truth that the British people, particularly the Labour Movement, must face up to.

Why then does the Government persist in denying that it is waging war against the People's Liberation Movement of Malaya? Why do the Tory, Labour and Liberal newspapers persist in their characterisation of the war as ' anti-banditry ' and a ' campaign against terrorism '? Why, above all, did Transport House resort to the unsavoury practice in 1948 and 1949 of circularising the trade unions in this country with literature slandering the Malayan People's Liberation Movement and certain of its personnel? The answer, I am sure, is this: they are afraid of the Labour Movement, of the ordinary work-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing men and women, and the peace-loving people of Britain. Consider for a moment the problems confronting the government propagandist; and the factors which decide his course of action. If he acknowledges the fighting in Malaya as a war, the people of Britain will wonder why they are plunged into another war so soon after the last debacle. They will begin to wonder, and resent the fact, that before they have begun to settle down to peaceful reconstruction again, their husbands and sons are being conscripted and sent 8,000 miles away to kill or be killed. The working men and women in Britain are, after all, people of responsibility who have had the ravages of war brought to their doorsteps, and will not go to war without a very cogent reason. If, therefore, the government propagandists and the city newspapers acknowledge the Malayan fighting as a war, the British people, particularly the Labour Movement, will want to know against whom the war is being fought and for what reasons. Above all, the Labour Movement of Britain has a proud tradition of struggle against the war of intervention which threatened to destroy the young U.S.S.R. It is a tradition enriched by the proud episode of the 'Jolly George', and of the 'Haruna Maru' when British dockers refused to handle arms for Japan's war of aggression against China. These are weighty considerations which the government propagandist has to face; and weighing them, he fears that he may not get the moral approval, let alone support in man-power and money, from the working men and women of this country, if he does not resort to some form of national deception. He decides to populate Malaya with a handful of 'bandits' and 'terrorists', and to hail Britain's military expedition in Malaya as a 'police action' against thuggery. It is a very simple lie. But the tragedy is, it worked. That is to say, it worked long enough for British people to be deceived into losing several hundred of their men-folk. It worked long enough to involve otherwise decent British working men and women into condoning the massacre of several thousand Malayan working men and women. It worked long enough to fool the people of Britain into allowing £100,000,000 a year to be poured into the Malayan battlefields. Most serious of all, it worked long enough to plunge the whole of Britain and S.E. Asia into a conflict which, in relation to the present international situation, is far more dangerous than the situation created by Japan's attack on Manchuria in 1931, by the Spanish civil war, or by Mussolini's invasion of Abyssinia. And we ought to remind ourselves that these 'incidents' of the 1930's were the precursors of the fascist armed march which culminated in the world-wide fascist onslaught of 1939-1945. The working men and women of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain must never again allow themselves to be deceived into massacre and destruction by yet another 'incident'—the Malayan 'incident'. We are no longer in the 1930's. This is an era menaced by the atom bomb and the H-bomb. It is also an era of overwhelming possibilities for lasting peace, for unprecedented friendship between peoples, and for immeasurable world prosperity. It is this which the Malayan people are striving to achieve. It is against this that Britain's war in Malaya is being waged. The situation is extremely dangerous.

What must the working men and women of Britain do to avert the danger? The war in Malaya is the direct concern of the British people in so far as Malaya is Britain's colony, and British troops and armaments are principally involved in the fighting. That, as it were, is the most proximate factor affecting Britain. But it is by no means the fundamental or decisive factor. It must be made clear that the British people themselves have nothing to gain and everything to lose if this war continues. The reason is plain: the war in Malaya is a colonial war, waged in defence of minority monopoly interests in what Sir Stafford Cripps has described as 'the largest dollar earners'—tin and rubber. Once upon a time, in the hey-day of imperialism, it could be said with truth that the maintenance of colonies was not only profitable to the monopoly interests but also made it possible for the ruling class to apportion a measure of these profits towards raising the standard of living of workers in the metropolitan country. There is a limit, however, both in the sphere of colonial exploitation and in the degree to which exploitation can be carried out with impunity. That limit has been passed, so far as the wealthiest colonies are concerned—Viet-Nam, Burma, Indonesia, and Malaya. So far as semi-colonies are concerned, the victorious upsurge of the 450 million Chinese people has shown decisively how the exploitation of man by man is no longer tolerated. The question which the working men and women of Britain must, therefore, ask themselves is this: now that it is clear that the maintenance of colonies can only lead to war, what stand should be taken towards the colonial peoples' liberation movements?

The answer is clear. Neutrality is impossible. Condonation of the war of suppression threatens the very security and lives of the working men and women of the imperialist countries themselves. Any war today aimed at the suppression of peoples is a danger to world peace. There is only one road to take. It is the road of unequivocal support, by action, of the colonial peoples' liberation movements. This is one of the necessary roads which the struggling masses in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imperialist country itself must take to arrive at their own economic prosperity and political freedom. The two struggles—the colonial peoples' struggle for freedom, and the British working class struggle —are inseparable. The same hands that have flung 10,000 Malayan workers into jail and murdered thousands of others, impose the wage-freeze in this country, and keep down the living standards of the workers of this country. Today, it is the colonies; tomorrow, it may be the British workers themselves. In the midst of imperialist suppression, those who suppress others, or condone the suppression of others, not only cannot be free, but must themselves be enslaved.

It is opportune that on the eve of May Day, 1950, the Labour Movement of Britain should brush aside all the imperialist propaganda and rise to forge one more unbreakable link with the workers and people of Malaya. They should get to know what the Liberation Movement fights for and who are the people in it.

(i) *The Malayan People's Liberation Army*. This is an Army of 10 Regiments, comprising workers and peasants. They include fighters from all sections of Malaya's multi-national population—Malays, Chinese, Indians and aborigines.

(ii) *Organisation and Equipment*. The Liberation Army operates as 'independent Regiments' in the 12 States of Malaya under the central command of the Liberation Army G.H.Q. Its main and most up-to-date equipment and arms have been captured from the invading forces. Tactical and political education form an essential part of life in the Liberation Army.

(iii) *Composition and Leadership*. The Liberation Army has in its ranks fighters from all classes, mainly workers and peasants, under the leadership of the Communist Party.

(iv) *Civilian Section*. The co-operation of non-combatant sections of the population has been considerably increased by underground units in enemy-occupied territory. Material support is obtained from the population, and through these units propaganda and political education is carried on all the time.

(v) *Programme of Liberation Movement*. The strengthening of the alliance of workers and peasants and people from all classes for the defeat of the imperialists and their local agents;

The intensification of armed struggle as the main form of struggle, supplemented by all other forms of struggle, according to the conditions prevailing in each territory;

The continuance of such struggle until the forces of imperialism and its agents are defeated;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM THE CHINE

In China villagers bring New Year presents to the so

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EOPLE'S REPUBLIC

banner greets 'The Meritorious Servants of the People'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The establishment of a Malayan People's Democratic Republic. Throughout this struggle the programme of land reform, and education, is being carried out where conditions permit.

(vi) *The Liberation Movement and World Peace.* The Malayan People's Liberation struggle is an integral part of the struggle of peace-loving peoples against colonialism, imperialism and all those who threaten a third world conflict. Its ultimate aim is to assist in the building of a free and democratic world and friendship with all peoples on a basis of equality.

Whilst the perpetrators of war are pressing forward with their preparations for extending the Malayan War, the urgent duty of the Labour Movement in Britain is to take immediate steps to ensure that this totally unjust and dangerous armed venture should be immediately stopped. It is not enough to condemn the war. Forthright and sustained action is necessary; (a) all working men and women of Britain, particularly those organised in Trade Unions and Co-operatives, should rally to form and support the campaign to stop the war in Malaya; (b) every worker in Britain must henceforth assert his right to distinguish between production for the good of humanity and production for war, and should act accordingly; (c) workers in this country have a sacred duty, and an honourable tradition to uphold, by staunchly refusing to handle any war equipment for Malaya or any other theatre where colonial wars exist; (d) it is the right and duty of the women of Britain to refuse to allow their husbands and sons to be sent to slaughter the sons and husbands of their sisters in Malaya; (e) working men and women of Britain, whose rates and taxes go into the Government coffers, have a right and duty to demand that their money should not be used for the crime and shame of armed conquest and slaughter.

All this can be done. In all the factories, dockyards, schools, and homes—in the Trade Unions, in the streets—there awaits the strong, sound common-sense and decency of the ordinary working men and women of Britain, seeking understanding and guidance in a situation which is clear and simple, but which has baffled them, nevertheless, because of strong imperialist propaganda. They can be won, and must be won. The stopping of the Malayan war *now* is no longer purely a Malayan question, nor purely a British colonial question, but a question of grave international importance.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SEEK PEACE FIRST

ILYA EHRENBURG

On March 17 Ilya Ehrenburg, member of the delegation of the Soviet Peace Committee, at the session of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress, declared:

DEAR FRIENDS! Every one of us, walking along the streets of Stockholm—one of the most beautiful cities of Europe—has probably often thought of how peace helps the creative genius of a people. The Swedes have long preferred the pick, spade and compass to the sword of Charles XII. The city in which we are now meeting was won by man from nature, from stern and unyielding cliffs. This is a splendid victory. And such bloodless victories we can only wish all the peoples.

It is easy to understand that there are no supporters of war in Sweden, but I am afraid that certain Swedes, although they undoubtedly set a high value on peace, still cannot be regarded as supporters of peace. We are well aware that it is not enough to thirst for peace, it is also necessary to know how to defend peace.

The residents of Oslo and Copenhagen loved peace no less than the people of Stockholm, and this love was just as passive as the love of peace of certain residents of Stockholm. If history is viewed as a senseless lottery, then it can be said that Sweden twice drew a lucky number, while Norway and Denmark, after one chance win, drew an equally chance blank. However, I do not think that the architects and steel workers of Sweden, that the mothers of Sweden would be satisfied with such an approach towards history, towards the future, towards their cities and their children. For it is quite possible, after two wins, to draw on the third occasion a blank, and now the peace-loving and industrious Swedes are involuntarily thinking about this. It is not enough to value peace. Peace must be defended.

One year has passed since our Paris Congress. The forces of the peace supporters have grown. They have grown to such an extent that the warmongers are compelled to redouble their deception, to increase coercion tenfold. However, the forces of the peace supporters have not yet grown to such an extent as to force the warmongers to abandon their criminal schemes. We are entering the decisive stage of our great battle for peace. Our children will either bless our

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

successful struggle or damn our vain efforts. The result of the peace struggle now depends on us. The danger of habit, of smugness and heedlessness is immense. . . The danger consists in the fact that, while reading about bombs and super-bombs day in and day out, people become accustomed to this howl of bloodthirsty men as to an inevitable accompaniment to life. This engenders the optimism of the ostrich. The Philistine says: ' This is not the first year that they have been writing about war and there is no war as yet. Hence—there will be no war '.

It also gives rise to pessimism, which is just as out of place as the above-mentioned optimism of the ostrich. The Philistine of the gloomy type thinks: 'If war is so much spoken of it means that war is inevitable, a year earlier or a year later. What can I, a little Durand or Smith, do? It is best to live quietly for a year or two and then—let come what may '. The strength of the warmongers consists in the fact that, by ceaseless talk about war, they befuddle people, compel the man in the street either to believe that the danger does not exist or to consider it inevitable. Our duty is to dispel naïve complacency and overcome dismal fatalism.

We must convince ordinary people the world over that it is on them alone that the issues of war or peace depend. Frankly speaking, it is not diplomats, and not even generals, who fight in battle. It is ordinary men who fight. If all those gentlemen who make bellicose speeches or compose bellicose works were to be brought together there would hardly be enough of them to form even one field company.

We know, dear friends, that we are not a gathering of a set of people who think alike, not a club of theorists. No, it is we, I repeat, precisely we who are the genuine representatives of the peoples of all the continents, of the peoples who do not want to fight in war and will not fight. We must firmly declare to all: 'The question of whether or not there will be war is not a question of a lottery or gamble. It is not even a question as to how many mentally unbalanced people hold responsible posts in this or that country. Whether or not there will be war depends on those millions of people whom we represent here '.

Every living man has a right to vote—the Negro from the Mississippi and the pariah from India, the farmhand from Sicily and the Marseilles stevedore. Let the world vote, not according to the instruction of charlatans, but let it vote honestly. Every living person has his right to vote and we know that every living man would vote

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the supporters of a new war. The dead have also the right to vote—the heroes of Stalingrad, the guerrillas of Europe, the victims of Lidice and Oradour, the innocent children who perished in London, in Rotterdam, and in Warsaw which has suffered so much. We remember the graves. And the dead cry out against the new bloodthirsty men, against these supermen with their loathsome superbombs.

The warmongers attempt to represent our movement, which unites people of different countries, different ideologies, as a movement allegedly defending the Soviet Union. I deem it necessary to state very clearly on my own behalf and on behalf of the whole Soviet delegation that it is not supporters of peace who defend the Soviet Union but that the Soviet people, together with other peoples, together with the best representatives of the American and British peoples, defend the cause of peace.

The Soviet people uphold peace, not because they have become weak. They defend peace because they are morally strong, because they believe in their future, in their creative labour and in the happiness of their children. We have no fear. Our strength has been tested, not on parades, not in Olympic games, but among the ruins of Stalingrad. And if we have come out victorious from the terrible single combat against the Fascist army, it is because we had armour which is really impregnable—the armour of our political consciousness, the armour of our conscience, the armour of our will for life.

In this city, which accidentally avoided the horrors of war, I want to say that by defending peace, we Soviet people are defending not only the children of Leningrad, a city which has shown that it cannot be brought to its knees, but the children of Stockholm as well, because to us your children are the future. Consequently they are our friends. And what are the children of Stockholm to the supermen with their super-bombs? They are a random target, an unimportant card in a bloody game of poker.

I want to remind you once again, my dear friends, that we Soviet people have confidence in the vitality of our ideas, and therefore we do not intend to back them up either by bombs or by super-bombs. We are confident of the triumph of our creative labour; therefore, we do not intend to prove the rightness of our world outlook by force. We are convincing and we shall continue to convince other people of our rightness—by our cities which are growing with every year, by our harvests, our books, by a growth of human consciousness which, in our country, outstrips the growth of all cities.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I want to explain once again our attitude towards those countries which have other ideas and another economy. We do not want to force the Soviet way of life on anyone. It is not an article for export.

In the Soviet Union there is peaceful Socialist competition. One plant issues a challenge to another plant regarding the effectiveness of their work, the quality of their output. Well, we Soviet people challenge our American ill-wishers to peaceful competition. The schemes of the warmongers are directed, not towards the triumph of one system of economy or another, not even a super-capitalist one, not towards the triumph of this or that idea, not even a super-individualistic one—the schemes of the supporters of war are aimed at the destruction of human culture.

We know that culture needs a progressive, creative inspiration, renewal. We Soviet people are endeavouring to continue in a worthy manner that which was created by our predecessors, by our ancestors, to continue that which was created by all ages, by all peoples. It is a fact, therefore, that all monuments of the past are dear to us, no matter in which country they may be, and all children are dear to us, no matter in what part of the world they are growing up.

The warmongers have invented a so-called 'Western culture', setting it up against us, the supporters of peace. I will ask everyone who is not without a sense of humour this question: to whom is the work of the scientists of France, Bartollet, Pasteur and Curie, more dear—to Mr. Acheson or to Joliot-Curie? Who is more concerned with the fate of the Louvre and the Prado—General Franco or Pablo Picasso? Who goes to see the plays of Shakespeare more often and who understands Shakespeare better—the Soviet workers or the slave-owners from the most venerable State of Mississippi?

Once again we must loudly proclaim that we, the supporters of peace regardless of the ideas to which we adhere, are the genuine defenders of human culture. We are defending the great and many-sided beehive of Europe, the cities which are dear to everyone, the museums, the schools. We are defending the culture of awakened Asia, the cradle of civilisation.

Recently one French Academician, obviously sympathising with the warmongers, wrote that China was now lost to European culture. No, China is now lost to ignorant, greedy and bloodthirsty businessmen. But China has now opened her gates to European culture and is ready in turn to enrich European culture with her creative achievements.

Our movement is growing in scale and in scope, but I venture to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say that it is not spreading and growing enough, as compared with the feelings of alarm and just indignation which are growing and spreading in the hearts of all honest people throughout the world. We must increase our efforts tenfold and truly unite all nations. We Soviet delegates stand for the expansion of our ranks. We hold out our hands to all supporters of peace, regardless of the ideas to which they adhere.

We are glad to see with us Father Boulier, the Dean of Canterbury, and clergy of various religious beliefs. We are glad to see with us Liberals, apologists of free competition, idealist philosophers, writers whose concepts about aesthetics and ethics are very different from our own. We shall argue in other places. Controversies make it easier to establish the truth. Here we are united in a single impulse which leaves no room for contradictions—in the struggle for peace.

The warmongers love to talk of the intolerance of Soviet people. They love to allege that we fence ourselves off from the world. Enough of that! Mr. Rogge has visited the Kremlin and while there he defended his ideas which are far from being ours. Because of that, we did not summon him before the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We talked it over with him in a friendly way. Where is it—that notorious ' Iron Curtain '? Who was it who dared not allow into his country the world-famous artist, Pablo Picasso, on the sole grounds that he is a supporter of peace? Who slammed the door in the face of the Dean of Canterbury? Was it a country of Marxists or a country of dubious Christians?

We represent the supporters of peace, and for the warmongers anyone who is a supporter of peace is a ' Red ', a ' Communist ', a person who must either be deported within 24 hours or put under lock and key.

The talks of the diplomats have lasted too long. The game of the lunatics with bombs has also been inexcusably dragged out. We must call upon all honest people of the world to raise their voices and demand immediate, completed and unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon. It is clear even to the very young that the atomic bomb is a weapon of aggression. Whoever attempts to come out against our movement, whoever attempts to prevent plain people from raising their voices, by so doing gives himself away, by so doing says: ' I am the aggressor of tomorrow '.

At the time of the Nuremburg Trial one of the accused said: ' We could not foresee that it would end precisely in this way . . .' The people who drenched Europe in blood did not foresee that they

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would land in the dock. Perhaps it will be in order for us to warn those who want to destroy culture, life and the future by means of the atomic bomb, that they will most surely meet their end sitting in the dock and not on the throne of world rulers.

Perhaps it will be in order to declare for all to hear that States, rulers and military men who dared to use the atomic weapon for their aggressive purposes, would be proclaimed criminals and would end their lives shamefully and terribly as murderers of humanity.

I presume that only criminals can protest against such a decision! If, in any country, any authorities should come out against our decision to regard as a war criminal anyone who employed the atomic weapon, then by so doing they would give themselves away and show that they themselves are candidates for the dock.

My dear friends! When we go back, each to his own country, we shall get down to work with renewed energy. Those important decisions which we must adopt here, will make our struggle for peace even more real and will draw millions upon millions of new followers into our ranks. We are not threatening anyone. But let those who threaten everyone know that they will be called to account. We are doing our solemn duty. We are the representatives of nations and we pledge ourselves to wrest the deadly weapon from the hands of the new blood-thirsty men. We will defend peace, thought and life.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PORTRAIT OF A RENEGADE

PALMIRO TOGLIATTI

The following letter by Palmiro Togliatti on how Ignazio Silone was expelled from the Communist Party has been specially translated for the 'Labour Monthly' from 'L'Unita' (6.1.50).

Dear Sir,

In the September-October 1949 issue of the Review *Communita* you published an article by Ignazio Silone entitled 'Emergency Exit'. If I understand correctly this is an extract from a projected anthology* by Communist renegades, i.e., by authors like Gide or Koestler or Silone himself, one time Communists or sympathisers, who have now turned anti-communists. From what I have read, the main purpose of this anthology is: according to some, to show how those who abandon Communism, acquire a particular state of mind, which they never lose; or, according to others, to prove that they are predestined to this course by some innate qualities. The implication is interesting and I don't deny that it could even be somewhat flattering for us Communists. If our movement were not a serious one, deeply involving our thoughts as well as our will power, not only would we not be—as we are—certain of our success, not only could we not have given our country men like Antonio Gramsci, and thousands of heroic fighters for freedom, but no one in our ranks would be interested in the psychology of our renegades. What interest could be found in the analysis of the motives inducing this once capable exponent of our ideas to leave his Party, only to rejoin it a short time after, become one of its leaders, leave it again, remain on the threshold, and so, go backward or forward, according to the direction of the wind which blows Ministers in and out of office?

In the article in question, however, in addition to this theme there are definite references to my person and to my activities. There are statements relative to the position Silone held in the Communist Party at a time when I was its most responsible leader. This gives me the right to publish a reply, or rather, a few corrections. I don't think it necessary to avail myself of the laws governing the Press, but rather of your courtesy and your interest in political discussion, to ask for some space in your columns. Moreover, in taking advantage

**The God That Failed: Six Studies in Communism.* (272 pp. Hamish Hamilton, 12*s.* 6*d.*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this elementary right of reply, I shall be able to contribute to the study of this very special psychology of the deserters from Communism, of whom no doubt, Silone is one of the most outstanding.

I have nothing particular to say about the episodes of his youth which made Silone (whom we then called Pasquini and whose real name is Tranquili) join the Party of the Proletarian Revolution. The path he followed was more or less the same as the one followed by most of our militants. The most important step, however, is the passage from general aspirations for justice for the workers, to the consciousness of what must be the revolutionary political party of the working class, in the prevalent political conditions. But for Ignazio Silone things have been a lot easier. However, he did not *leave* our Party but was expelled from it. Therefore it was not he who decided that he was not fitted for our Party; it was we who concluded from long experience, that he lacked the qualities, not merely of a leader but of a simple rank and file member of the Communist Party. And I would like to add at once, that I am referring here to the elementary qualities of honesty and sincerity towards the organisation to which one belongs, of devotion to the cause for which this organisation fights.

I leave aside the part dealing with the crisis facing the Communist Parties of several countries at the time of the formation of the Comintern. This Communist International—as its name indicates—could not be a gathering of reformists, anarchist trade unionists, extremists, opportunists, dull-witted intellectuals. It was necessary to select and train new political cadres in the international working class movement, and without bitter political struggles this has never been, and will never be, possible.

I want to deal immediately with the fact which Silone regards as crucial in his article, and around which he builds a scandal: the meeting in May, 1927, of the enlarged Executive Committee of the Comintern. The facts are as Silone tells them (except for some minor inaccuracies on which I will not insist); I sincerely fail, however, to understand how one can interpret what happened at this meeting as a proof that the 'Russian leading group' was guilty of intriguing and using its all-powerful influence to hamper the free expression of opinion of the other affiliated Parties. At this meeting the Soviet delegation introduced a draft resolution against Trotsky and the Trotskyites. The resolution was such that, had it been approved, it would have meant the expulsion from the Communist movement of the condemned group. The French, Italian, Swiss (and, if I remem-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber rightly, the Belgian) delegates stated that they were not yet convinced of the necessity of such a vote. These were the Parties which, for various reasons, were not very well acquainted with the fight against Trotskyism which was going on inside the Russian Party. For us, Italian Communists, we thought, rightly or wrongly, that we had to take into account the necessity of training our cadres, at liberty in the country, or in prison; we were afraid, I repeat rightly or wrongly, that a decision taken at that meeting would not be understood by all. What did the Russian comrades do then? Silone himself says: ' If a single delegate, said Stalin, is opposed to the draft resolution, it will not be presented in plenary session '. The delegations mentioned above did not change their opinion, the draft resolution was therefore withdrawn. Can such an attitude be described as perfidious or dictatorial? On the contrary it seems to me, convinced of our ' good faith ' and being ' in good faith ' themselves, the Russian comrades respected our ' freedom ' of not being at all convinced, they accepted that we should wait, ' experiment ' by ourselves, etc. In one word, they did exactly what Silone and the other renegades accused them of being unable to do.

Thus I have given an example of a slanderer who by his own words, by the example he has himself chosen, destroys his own libels.

Judging the facts now, I realise that our reservations to the bolshevik proposals were out of place. Stalin was right, he knew better than we did how well Trotsky could develop into a traitor. And the Executive who some time later condemned Trotsky was composed of comrades who had then acquired that knowledge, by bitter experience. The Executive had full rights to act in the way it did: but, had we wanted it, we could quite well have stated our disagreement with no other risk than that of starting a discussion. Not only did we not do so, because we understood how things were developing, but Silone himself did not even attempt to suggest it. Not only merit, but history itself has shown who was right. Whereas the line of policy defended by Stalin on the Chinese Revolution brought Mao Tse-tung to power, Trotsky degenerated into a traitor.

But let us come to the best part of the article inasmuch as Silone is concerned. He wondered how the advice could have been given to the British Communists to hide their Communist tendencies from their reactionary trade union leaders in order to remain in the Unions. It seems that an everlasting friend of ' truth ' is thus revealed in him, a bitter enemy of all forms of ' lies '. But in the same way one could have made it a reproach to the Communists working

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Italy under fascism, not to have publicly made known their sympathies, or not to have disclosed them to the ' Ovra '. To exclude a worker from a Trade Union because he is a Communist is a reactionary measure of a fascist type, from which it is justified to escape by any means. . . But, this very sincere Silone, this defender of Truth since his childhood, how did he behave in our Party?

The famous meeting which revealed to Silone the depths of Communist ' immorality ', and of their ' bankruptcy ' took place in 1927. Silone was expelled from the C.P. by a resolution approved on the 4th of July, 1931, by the Political Bureau of the Swiss C.P. in which he had taken refuge. Four years of excruciating crises, of reflection, of internal torment? Not even in dreams! During these years Silone continued to belong to our highest leading bodies, to our Central Committee, to our Political Bureau (the actual leadership), to our Secretariat, and was our secretary in charge of organisation. Nor can it be said that in these posts he remained passive, an indifferent spectator of a fatal degeneration. On the contrary, without any scruples of morality and sincerity, the same person who pretends to have been the prey of atrocious doubts was fighting actively to become the leader of our whole Party. Was it ambition? Was he moved by some other person for obvious reasons? Or was it his nature which made him, as it does today, destroy the organisation to which he belonged? To answer this question is not easy today.

But let us come to the reasons for which Silone was expelled from our ranks. In 1929 and 1930 we had to lead an energetic campaign to rid ourselves of some opportunist elements in our leadership. The first to be expelled was Angelo Tasca, who during the German occupation of France ended among the ' Socialist ' partisans of Pétain and of collaboration with Hitler. Silone approved this expulsion, he voted for it, together with all the others. He wrote articles to explain the correctness of such an action. However, Tasca's expulsion and the necessity to correct certain mistakes made previously by the whole leadership, had created a confused situation. That is when Silone intervened actively by a letter which he wrote to the Central Committee on January 15, 1930. In this letter, while acknowledging that the leaders of the Party had until then preoccupied themselves more with the main difference between these gentlemen and us (happily for our country our Party has always been led by men who put the future of their movement above themselves) he accused us of not having been able to apply correctly the line of the Comintern; he then suggested himself as the only person able to understand it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to apply it. When one reads what he writes today, how he affirms that already in 1927, and even before, he saw the bankruptcy of the Comintern and condemns, or moral grounds, the method by which it was led, and when one thinks that in 1930 he wanted to be considered as the real trustee of that same International, one begins to have a clear idea of what morality means to Silone; one begins to understand a little better the very particular psychology of these renegades; one realises how impossible it is for them to remain in an organisation of honest fighters and of decent beings.

But perhaps it will be interesting to know how Silone organised his attack upon us. Perhaps the Honourable Saragat and the Honourable Romita find in it some analogies with recent happenings and draw from it some useful lessons.

At the same time as Silone was writing his letter to the Central Committee three other leading members started an attack in the Political Bureau for a radical change of policy and of leadership. They particularly advocated that the continuous efforts to maintain the Party alive inside the country should be abandoned, disguising under various pretexts their liquidationist tendencies. Of course, the 'three' and Silone were in agreement. By this manœuvre, which was to remain secret, Silone was preparing for himself the opportunity of presenting himself to us (and indeed to the Comintern itself) as the only person, above the two opposing groups, who could save the situation by taking the leadership into his own hands. The plan failed. The majority of the leadership condemned Silone as well as the 'three'. The Central Committee in which were the comrades working inside Italy, unhesitatingly confirmed this condemnation and made its terms more severe. The 'three' then passed to an open fight against the Party, joined the French Trotskyist groups, and initiated a public campaign of calumny against the Party itself and against its leaders. They could but be expelled, and they were.

Then came the *coup de théâtre*. Silone, not solicited by anybody, sent to the Central Committee (January, 1931) a statement in which he declared: I agree with the general line of the Italian Communist Party and of the Comintern (1 and 2); I never had and I still do not have any connection, political or organisational, with the expelled group (3); I condemn this group . . . and I declare myself in solidarity with the fight that the I.C.P. and the Comintern are waging against them and against the Trotskyist faction (4); I accept without reservations the discipline and decisions of the Comintern and of the Italian Communist Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The statement was exhaustive, self critical, vigorous and spontaneously uttered, and as we had as yet no proofs that in writing it Silone was being an unashamed liar, the matter would have rested there. But the statement was raised publicly and it was the turn of the ' three ' to protest vehemently, to make public the proofs that Silone had always been in agreement with them, knew of their relationship with Trotsky, had followed their activities, backed them, led them in their fight against the Party. All this was revealed in an abundant correspondence with Silone which was published by Trotsky himself.

Our champion of ' truth ', our ' greatest enemy of lies ', once unmasked made another attempt. He sent us a letter which could be cited as a perfect example of hypocrisy. The letter is in our hands and could be published if necessary. The arguments which Silone advanced were that he did not himself write the communications coordinating his activity with that of the Trotskyist group; they had been written (by his wife) at his dictation; and after all that he ended saying that he could remain in the Communist Party as long as he lived. . . We considered this document as a definite proof of the impossibility of retaining in our Party, which is a serious organisation, such a blatant champion of double dealing; we asked the Swiss Party to take the necessary steps and after a meeting chaired by Ruggiero Gricco—and not by Di Vittorio—the expulsion took place.

But here too Silone wants to add a lie. As he could not play the hero and the persecuted, while all proofs of this lamentable story were still available, he pretended to have been expelled for ' defamatory ' motives, i.e., for having declared himself a ' pervert '. By doing so, he thought, perhaps, to surround himself with some of the aura of perversion that another renegade, Andre Gide, likes so much. But the facts are not so.

The notice of expulsion issued by the Swiss comrades, was published in our Review, *The Workers' State*. It is in two pages. First it gives the point of view defended by Silone in his written documents —then it describes exactly the conversation which took place at the conclusive meeting; among other things it says. . . ' He confirmed all the points in his letter. . . He declared, being a political pervert, that his case was a clinical one, etc '. The motives of his expulsion follow: no reference at all is made to this confession, but a political summary is given of the whole attitude of the expelled, underlining that it tended clearly to disintegrate the leading bodies of our Party, in one of the most difficult periods of our existence.

Today Silone's attitude is presented to us as a revelation of I don't

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

know what values of modern metaphysics, of a special ethics, misunderstood, trampled upon, destroyed, by us militant Communists. Such is the fashion. But we are simple men. Our morality does not know these metaphysical complications, by which a charlatan may become a hero, of abstract thought and of pure will power. We trust the judgment of simple men. The intriguer, we call an intriguer; the liar, a liar. For the former and for the latter, there is no place in our ranks. That is all.

With thanks,

Sincerely yours,

PALMIRO TOGLIATTI.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

SURPLUS-VALUE

'Ever since the publication of *Das Kapital* economists have been trying to avoid the fact of surplus-value. In Cambridge they have done this mainly by ignoring it. Oxford has patronisingly regarded it as of historical interest. Scotsmen have consistently misunderstood it. Wiser than all, Boehm-Bawerk (who at any rate held Marx's intellect in wholesome respect) and the Austrian School proceeded to revolutionise economic method, hoping that in the process the surplus-value problem would get lost altogether. But although those who inhabit sheltered seats of learning and contemplate absolute truth may have succeeded in forgetting Marx, the hard facts of the class struggle persistently force him on the attention: history itself refuses to allow him to be treated as a mere historical antiquity'.

(Maurice Dobb, May, 1925.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MILITARISM AND YOUTH

WALTER DAVIS

> Take a boy who is 14 years old. He goes into the Army Cadets and when he is 15 or 16 leaves school and becomes a member of a Cadet Battalion. When he becomes 18 he is called up for National Service. On the completion of his National Service he has a legal liability to serve in the Territorial Army. When he has finished his T.A. service he could stay on as a volunteer or, being a trained and disciplined man, he could report for C.D. work. In due course . . . he goes into the Home Guard. Finally he dies and is buried. . . The nation will have need of disciplined people, people who are used to obeying orders.
>
> (Field Marshal Montgomery, Sept. 30, 1948.)

FROM July 1 every lad who completes his 18 months' National Service will have to serve compulsorily for four years in the Territorial Army. Why? What new military commitments have we? What will this mean to Britain's youth and to the Labour movement? In fact for those six years the army will absorb all a man's time and attention.

Just what this burden is, is worth detailed examination. Lads will have to complete 60 days' military training in the four years. The penalty for failure to attend camps will be £25 or two years' imprisonment. Failure to attend drills will result in a £5 fine. Employers will be under no legal obligation to release men for the annual camps, so that for four years after their release from full-time service many men will get no summer holidays at all. It is not likely that many employers will grant holidays on top of leave to attend the Territorial camps. Where, as will frequently be the case, a man gets one week's holiday, he will have to make the remaining time up by weekend camps. The conscript will get no bounty during his four year period unless he becomes a Territorial volunteer, so that not only will he be under heavy propaganda pressure, but also there is to be sharp financial inequality to induce him to 'sign on'. *A vital, but perhaps little realised point is that the whole National Army—Regular, Territorial and Supplementary Reserve—is liable to immediate mobilisation for use in any part of Britain or overseas without any other formalities or proclamations.* The position of the lad who wants to study or to learn his trade will be made very difficult. Having spent 18 months in the Forces, men have come out and by determined efforts carried on their studies and done much to make

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up the ground they lost during military service. Now the combination of weekend camps and evening drills is going to make the position of such men very nearly impossible. There will be little time for leisure, let alone study.

The Trade Union movement of this country was up to 1939 firmly and traditionally opposed to conscription. In 1946, with reservations about how long it would need to be maintained, the Labour movement accepted conscription on the assumption of peaceful international co-operation within the United Nations. The Trade Unions have never intended support for the Labour Government's foreign policy, and this was evidenced by the lack of support for the T.A. recruiting drive that came from the union branches and Trades Councils. Trade Unionists rightly protest when they see the Government they put in faithfully following the same war policies as Churchill and Montgomery and, above all, the warmongering American capitalists.

In 1947 Harold Laski, in the chair at the Labour Party Conference, protested against suggestions that the Government were likely to follow anything but their own independent policy:

> The notion that Mr. Attlee and his colleagues are the playthings of the General Staff, that what Field Marshal Montgomery and his colleagues say to them one day they will repeat in the House of Commons the next, ought not to be made as an accusation against the Labour Government. Mr. Attlee . . . has a gorgeous obstinacy when he had made up his mind against which the waves of Field Marshal Montgomery's charm, as the reduction from 18 to 12 months showed clearly, break and break in vain.

It was not so long before Mr. Attlee's 'gorgeous obstinacy' melted to subservient co-operation before the dollar persuasions that are stronger and even more sinister than Field Marshal Montgomery's charm. In his most recent wave of charm, produced for the benefit of the Americans, this man who describes himself as a 'Christian soldier at war with Communists' was looking forward to a 'jolly good party' in which a lot of people would be killed. This is the tune to which the Labour Government is willingly dancing when it imposes this new burden on the National Service man.

His education in current affairs will be the direct interest of the army authorities. What form this will take we can see very clearly from the words of Lt.-Col. T. A. Lowe, D.S.O., M.C., who, as military editor of the Services and Territorial Magazine, wrote in the February issue:

> There is far too much of this secrecy. Tell the National Service man and Territorial what he is wanted for: that Soviet Russia is planning the utter

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

destruction of Britain, and without him she will have a bloodless victory, the result of which will be centuries of slavery for this country.

By means of this sort of propaganda the Tory clique of professional soldiers and warmongers will try to train a whole generation of young men to accept their anti-Soviet and anti-working class ideas.

These proposals have most serious consequences for the Labour movement. Just at that period when working class youth should be recruited into their union or taking some active part in their T.U. branch, they will instead be listening to officers who consider the use of troops as blacklegs just part of the day's work. The type of man who will make up the officer class in the T.A. will, if anything, be more right-wing and more reactionary than his regular army colleagues. Many of them are undoubtedly local Tory bigwigs, and, of course, some of them will be the local employers into the bargain. What a wonderful set-up this will provide the capitalist class with for meeting any major industrial unrest. Troops indoctrinated for six years with anti-Trade Unionism will be used to break strikes, and worse, under the command of officers who are the employers themselves. There may even be cases where an employer is able to maintain military discipline over some of his own workers who serve under him in the same unit. This is the undemocratic and anti-working class character of these latest measures. *It is time for the Labour movement to take vigorous action to get the statute that introduces compulsory service in the Territorial Army repealed, and to renew the fight for the reduction of the period of National Service from* 18 *months to* 12.

It is important to see that this is only the latest step in the Government's long-established plans to militarise the young workers of Britain and place them at the disposal of the Anglo-American Chiefs of Staff. This is the direct effect of the Atlantic Pact on the people of this country, and of the obligation to provide sections of the ground forces of Western Union. Just over a year ago, against strong protests from wide sections of the Labour movement, the Government increased the period of conscription from a year to 18 months—so that the men they sent into the Malayan jungle to keep safe the profits of the rubber planters could have longer training before they went, and so that there would be sufficient troops to preserve a brutal reign of 'law and order' in the African colonies. So, step by step, while talking of democratic armies, of independence for the colonies, of peaceful intentions and support for the United Nations, the Labour Government fits into the pattern of American war plans against the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the fight against capitalism, the working class itself has great need of the militancy that the young workers can bring into the struggle. The army takes advantage of the natural spirit of adventure in lads of 18, and tries to deceive them into thinking that they will find the adventure they seek in military service. The ex-Serviceman can soon dispel the illusions about army life, but youth's search for adventure must be fulfilled. They must be shown that in the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies that are building Socialism, youth finds real adventure—the adventure of building a new life, very different from the so-called 'adventure' of killing and death that awaits the young conscript in the jungles of Malaya. All militant and class-conscious workers must fight to win their sons, the young workers, for the struggle to defeat capitalism. As Britain's youth grasps the meaning and the promise of Socialism it will become a courageous force in the fight for peace and a better life.

Book Reviews

'A MASK LIKE CASTLEREAGH'

The Diplomat, by James Aldridge. (728 pp. The Bodley Head. 12*s.* 6*d.*).

By isolating an imaginary incident in recent diplomatic history, describing it in detail; and revealing the character and motives of the personalities involved, Mr. Aldridge, in his new novel, has given us an inside view of the way in which Foreign Office activities are still conducted. When, at short notice, the experienced diplomat, Lord Essex, was despatched to Moscow to discuss the situation in Azerbaijania, he chose as his expert assistant a young man from the India Office who, on paper, had all the necessary qualifications. MacGregor, in addition to an unimpeachable background and an excellent war record, had spent most of his life in Persia, knew the people, spoke their languages and understood their problems. He seemed just the right man for the job but, unfortunately for Lord Essex, he had not been long enough in a Government office to become tamed and conditioned. A geologist by profession, MacGregor was a man of intellectual integrity with a scientist's respect for facts and an honest man's dislike of political chicanery. After some weeks in Moscow, where they secured an interview with Stalin, Essex and MacGregor, accompanied by a young woman from the British Embassy, Katherine Clive, set out on a fact-finding expedition to Persia. In the course of their exciting adventures, in a country with which the author is evidently familiar, the clash of temperament and outlook between Essex and MacGregor becomes sharply defined. Whereas Essex, as a loyal servant of the Crown, regards his task merely as a 'cold war' operation against the U.S.S.R. and quickly turns his mission of investigation into a scheme to buy and cajole political influence, MacGregor is naïve enough to believe that its object is to find out the truth. When the three return to London, Essex draws up the sort of report which will

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enable the Anglo-American majority on the Security Council, where he is to act as British Representative, to win another round in the perennial conflict with the Soviet Union. MacGregor's report, which in essential particulars contradicts the conclusions of his chief, is quietly pigeon-holed. In great distress of mind and conscience, MacGregor conceives it his duty to make public in a letter to *The Times* the various points on which they differ. The consequences of this indiscretion were a political sensation of the first order, which led to a Debate in the House of Commons at the conclusion of which the Government re-affirmed its complete confidence in Lord Essex and announced that MacGregor had been 'dishonourably dismissed' from the public service. If the House of Commons scene is less convincing than the preceding episodes, it at least enables the author, through the mouth of a Socialist M.P., to deliver a speech on Red-baiting and its consequences, which is magnificent in its clarity and force.

In a short notice it is impossible to do justice to the sustained brilliance of this novel which may well be regarded as the most important work of fiction produced in England in the past five years. Mr. Aldridge writes with the confidence of one who has first-hand knowledge of all the places, problems and contrasted types of people he describes. The insight and objectivity shown in the delineation of the principal characters, and the skill with which the 'supporting cast' of j o u r n a l i s t s, politicians and Embassy officials are touched in, are beyond praise.

DOUGLAS GOLDRING.

THE NEW GERMAN MYTH

Hitler as War Lord, by Franz Halder. (70 pp. Putnam and Co. 3*s.* 6*d.*).

THE author of this short book is Colonel-General Franz Halder, Chief of the German General Staff 1938-1942. It was first published in the Western Zone of Germany, and, bearing the imprint 'U.S. Military Government Information Licence', became a best-seller. The thesis of the book is simple—Nazi Germany lost the Second World War, not because it was fighting a war of unjust imperialist aggression, not because of the superior morale, strategy and leadership of the Red Army, not because of the world-wide resistance of the people to fascism, but because of Hitler and his false foolish leadership of the German military forces. If the German High Command had been left to conduct the war in its own way, General Halder suggests, Germany would have been victorious.

We have heard all this before. This was the vain propaganda line of German reaction after World War I, but this time it is Hitler who has become the scapegoat. In other words, this is a dangerous, lying effort to whitewash German imperialism and to falsify history. This new attempt to create the myth that the German Army was conquered only through the stupidity of one man is part of the whole process of the restoration of German militarism and fascism under Anglo-American control. General Halder says to the German people—have confidence in us, the German Generals of the old régime: we were not defeated; *we* will lead Germany back to 'greatness'. To Anglo-American reaction, he says—put your money on us; we are the men who will prepare and lead a new war against the Soviet Union.

And so the myth is born and disseminated, the war guilt of German Imperialism concealed, the formidable achievements of the Red Army and the historic role of the Soviet State removed from history. There is one interesting section in this book. It shatters the Churchill pretext for delaying the Second Front owing to the supposed armed strength of the Atlantic defences. Halder writes:—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> At no time was the Atlantic Wall any serious hindrance to the enemy landings . . . Had the enemy command not allowed itself to be delayed by the expectation of rational German counter-measures they could easily have hewed the way back over the Rhine to the German troops operating under the constraint of Hitler's generalship.

Hitler, says General Halder, lacked, above all, one quality, 'a humble submission before God'. But this, it appears, is not lacking to the other members of the Nazi High Command like Generals Halder, Guderian, Manteuffel and all the other relics of the Nazi régime now taken over by U.S. imperialism to prepare the war (of Christian civilisation?) against the U.S.S.R. and Peoples' Democracies. The writing, licensing (by the U.S. authorities) and distribution of this book is part of the general plan of Western imperialism to rebuild a reactionary Western Germany as an anti-Soviet war base. With the body of Halder and the spirit of Hitler what more could Wall Street want?

JAMES KLUGMANN.

THE OTHER SPAIN

Cultura y Democracia (First number, January 1950. 96 pp. 38, rue des Amandiers, Paris XXe. 40 *francs*).

A BARCELONA fascist publication ('Solidaridad Nacional') has been complaining that 'a poetic fifth column is being formed in Spain', that 'we are enduring a poetic offensive on a big scale'. The trouble is that the younger generation of Spanish intellectuals are turning away from Franco's literary hacks towards poets and writers associated with the Republic. The Falangist journal complains with particular bitterness of the admiration felt for the poet Antonio Machado who, it says, 'always belonged to the other Spain'. And the alarm of the fascists is increased by the fact that in a ballot carried out in Madrid literary cafés to decide who were the greatest figures in Spanish intellectual life in the first half of the present century, the first places went to Machado, Lorca, Falla and Valle Inclán, all of them enemies of fascism.

Despite the pictures of new buildings in Spain to which *The Times* has been giving such prominence recently, Franco Spain, like Hitler Germany, is a cultural desert with all the best writers, artists, scientists and other intellectuals either forced into illegality or driven into exile. The appearance of the first issue of *Cultura y Democracia* in Paris is proof however, if proof is needed, that the 'other Spain', the Spain of democracy, still carries forward all that is best in Spain's cultural tradition. The journal announces that its mission is 'to fight against Francoism in the sphere of culture and ideas, to serve the cause of the people who suffer and fight'. Besides a mass of admirably presented information on the ruin which Franco has brought to Spain, contrasted with the progress made under the Republic and with the successes achieved in the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies, this first issue also contains articles on the early democratic struggles in Spain, true stories of the Resistance, poems by Galician guerrilla fighters, a talk by George Dimitrov on the role of the novel in which he referred particularly to Cervantes, and a great deal more as well.

Cultura y Democracia has made a good beginning. It is a timely reminder, not only of the suffering in Franco Spain, but also of the rapid material and cultural progress which could be achieved in a democratic Spain.

L. ELLIOTT.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATE, POLITICS, PARLIAMENT

The Ship of State, The Essentials of Political Science. By Edward Jenks, D.C.L., LL.D., etc. With an additional chapter by Frances E. L. Boyd, M.A. (214 pp. Duckworth. 8*s.* 6*d.*).

The British Approach to Politics. By Michael Stewart, M.P. (336 pp. Allen and Unwin. 16*s.*).

The English Parliament. By Kenneth Mackenzie. (207 pp. Pelican Books, A. 208. Penguin Books. 1*s.* 6*d.*).

A SCIENTIST who wrote a book about the ocean, which neglected to mention water, except in an odd paragraph or two, and then only referred somewhat casually to the 'theory that the ocean consists mainly of water' and dismissed it as 'a question too large for discussion', would probably have difficulty in finding a publisher. No such difficulty seems to have troubled Dr. Edward Jenks, who performed a feat similar to that of our imaginary scientist. His book, which was first published in 1939 and then reprinted in 1945, has now been reprinted again, with additions. The explanation is that Dr. Jenks wrote, not about the ocean, but about the state. And as Lenin told the students of Sverdlov University, '. . . you will scarcely find another question which has been so confused, deliberately or not, by the representatives of bourgeois science, philosophy, jurisprudence, political economy and journalism, as the question of the state'. Dr. Jenks seemed to find difficulty in making up his mind whether classes exist in society, and to emphasise this he put the word 'class' in inverted commas. He then screwed up his courage and defined a 'class' as 'a body of persons within a society, which is differentiated from society at large by the exercise of certain functions, or the suffering of certain disabilities, distinguishing it from other members of the society'. Having administered a mild snub to Marx and having achieved a definition which would presumably enable him to describe professional conjurers, policemen and colour-blind persons as so many separate 'classes', he then proceeded airily to dismiss the subject, saying: 'Whether the existence of "classes" in a national community is, in itself, a good thing or a bad thing, is a subject too large for discussion in a work on political, as distinguished from social science, and on which much could be said on both sides'. Near the beginning of his book Dr. Jenks gave the reader a good idea of what to expect, when, in writing on 'the State as an Institution', he said 'An institution has, in itself, no material existence. It is a valuable achievement of the human mind, whereby a purely intellectual concept provides for the performance by individuals of functions which, it is anticipated, will, from time to time, require to be performed, not necessarily in the interest of the individuals performing them, but, it may be, in the interests of some wider body of persons, who, it is assumed, may be affected by their performance'. The publisher's 'blurb' refers to Dr. Jenks's 'combination of scholarship and lucidity'. Two hundred pages of it, enlivened by incursions into what Dr. Jenks conceived to be history, anthropology, zoology, etc., and illuminated by such great thoughts as 'The Fascist organisation is, in fact, the result of a well-known biological process known as "reversion to type"', are an ordeal not to be undertaken lightly.

Mr. Michael Stewart, in *The British Approach to Politics,* covers some of the same territory as Dr. Jenks. He has, however, a different approach. It could scarcely be otherwise, for Mr. Stewart is a Labour M.P. and a Minister, and he could scarcely afford to make a practice of indulging in Dr. Jenks's brand of 'lucidity', even if he wanted to. He does recognise the existence of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classes. He says that 'the educational system, the method of recruitment for the higher ranks of the Civil Service and the Armed Forces, the influence of money at elections, combine to put a great proportion of power in the hands of a small section of the people'. He thinks that 'the extent to which we may exercise our liberties is . . . shown to be determined very largely by the police, and in the last resort by the courts'. He says that 'the State is the permanent organisation of law and order', which, whatever its shortcomings as compared with the definitions of Engels and Lenin, has certain advantages over Dr. Jenks's 'piece of mental machinery'. Unfortunately Mr. Stewart does not inquire very deeply into the question: 'Whose law and order?'

He gives a clear and workmanlike account of some of the facts of Parliamentary procedure, local government administration, etc. He urges the need for tolerance, has great faith in education and is full of good will for many men—though not noticeably for those who live in the U.S.S.R. or for Communists elsewhere. Mr. Stewart's technique is to refer to some of the disadvantages of capitalism, to various well-known forms of oppression, discrimination, injustice and the like, and then to give his readers the impression that if people will only be as unbiased and enlightened as he is, things will be a lot better in the future. Just how this transformation is to be effected and just what the Labour Government has done to bring it about are left a little vague. It is true that this book was originally published in 1938, but the latest edition was extensively revised in 1948. The chapter on the Empire is a good example of the author's talent for glossing over ugly realities. Certain events in Ireland and India are deplored. It is pointed out that 'in many Colonies, the right of attacking and criticising the Government is more restricted than it is here'. However, we are told that India and Pakistan have emerged, Burma is independent, trade unionism among native populations has been permitted and encouraged, and 'Malaya secured an advance in self-government'. Even making allowances for a remarkable capacity for 'looking on the bright side', one wonders how Mr. Stewart has reconciled his membership of the Labour Government in recent years with some of the aims and ideals outlined in his book. Writing of the position of a Government M.P. who votes for a piece of policy he does not like, Mr. Stewart says: 'The Member, at the worst, does not want to risk his own seat; more creditably he might feel that the Government's policy is so much better than the Opposition's that he ought not to endanger it for the sake of one point'. What happens if there is not one point, but many, if the M.P. is also a Minister, and if the Government's policy is indistinguishable from the Opposition's, is something we are left to work out for ourselves. This is a pity, because a chapter on the mental processes involved in writing a book in favour of socialism and being a member of Mr. Attlee's Government would not have been without interest.

Kenneth Mackenzie's book is less ambitious than those of Mr. Jenks and Mr. Stewart, and it is none the worse on that account. He sets out to 'explain how Parliament came to be what it is'. As a factual account of the development of Parliament, its composition, functions, committees, etc., the book has a good deal to recommend it. It is less successful when it touches on the question of *why* various changes occurred. It is a pity that it was not revised with greater care. The reader may find it a little disconcerting to be told that 'Charles II came into the House in 1642 to arrest the Five Members' and then a few pages later, to see an interval between 1614 and 1620 described as '10 years'.

R. MALCOLM.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INDIA

India Today, by R. Palme Dutt. (581 pp. Available from Collet's, London. 12*s.* 6*d.*).

R. PALME DUTT'S 'India Today', first published in Britain ten years ago, has been of recent years almost unobtainable, owing to the destruction of the remaining copies by enemy action. The Second Indian Edition (People's Publishing House, Ltd., Bombay, *Rs.* 6), revised and brought up to date, is therefore all the more welcome, and will lead, we hope, to a similar English edition being brought speedily on to the home market.

There is great need for this clear Marxian analysis of the complex Indian situation, which is causing bewilderment and concern throughout the Labour movement. Through the praise showered on each other by the Labour leaders for their act in bestowing formal independence on the Indian landlords and millionaires, people are beginning to see a glimmer of the real truth as revealed even in the scanty press reports of the Indian situation. What sort of an independence is this, they wonder, that creates a régime of repression and terror far worse than British tyranny? What sort of an Independent Government is it which throws the best fighters for Indian independence back into the former British prisons from which they had only recently been liberated?

R. P. Dutt in his last chapter answers these and other questions in a brilliant interpretation of the new technique of imperialism—the technique of indirect rule through the imperialists' class-collaborators in the colonial countries. It is the technique that Britain has employed in Egypt, Irak and Transjordan, and that America is employing in the Philippines and in Central America. In exploring the full meaning of the Mountbatten Plan, the cynical exploitation of communal differences, the working of the Neo-Fascist Patel-Nehru régime, and the imperialist nature of the British Labour Government, Dutt's book is invaluable. The book ends with an encouraging appraisal of the growing strength of the vigorous popular movement for genuine national liberation and social liberation, which is by no means unworthy of the great social and political revolution now sweeping Asia.

LESTER HUTCHINSON.

HANKEY-PANKEY

Politics, Trials and Errors, by Lord Hankey (150 pp. Pen-in-Hand, Oxford. 8*s.* 6*d.*).

LORD HANKEY, P.C., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., Secretary to British Cabinets for twenty years, a former Minister and much else besides, has made the mistake of writing a book. The 'trials' of the title are the War Crimes Trials, of which Lord Hankey greatly disapproves. He asks whether they are not 'a bad precedent for the future'. Despite the author's disclaimers and whatever his intentions may have been, the book amounts to an apologia for the war criminals of World War Two. As such, it may provide welcome bedside reading for would-be aggressors in a third world war, but, except in such 'interested' circles, it is hard to see how it will enhance Lord Hankey's reputation. It is a pity the publishers did not see fit to include one of the Belsen pictures, even if this meant omitting the distinguished countenance of the author which adorns the frontispiece.

L.E.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ginning in 1933, which included: *Marxism After Fifty Years*, by R. Palme Dutt; *How Lenin Studied Marx*, by N. Krupskaya; *Marxism and Ireland*, by Sean Murray; *Dialectical Materialism and Communism*, by L. Rudas; *Marxism and Lancashire*, by W. Rust; *Engels and Science*, by J. D. Bernal; and *Who is Prosperous in Palestine?* by 'British Resident'.

CO-OP. 'DIVI'

Many thanks indeed to those who gave us names and addresses of people to whom they wanted us to send sample copies. We are always delighted to do so. It is a sure circulation-raiser. One reader has suggested giving us occasionally the benefit of her Co-op. 'divi', and asks whether we have a trading number which she can quote. We have; and in case other Co-op. readers are interested, here it is: Number 99482 in the London Co-operative Society. Members of provincial societies should quote it as L99482. And many thanks for the thought!

'LAY OFF BATH'!

'Exeter's' stand-in scheme is beginning to cause feeling to run high among citizens and friends of towns who languish in the stand-in group. Readers are beginning to send their 1s. a month to promote the home town to the steady money ranks. What a pugnacious spirit the smaller cities display! A determined character from Bath writes: 'Tell D. Mayo thanks very much, but he can lay off Bath! I enclose 10s., of which 5s. is to put Bath in the steady money'; and here is 1s. each stand-in money for Aylesbury, Watford, Taunton, Warwick and Cardiff. R.J.R. is determined to protect the fair name of his city before it even gets a stand-in: 'Here's 3s. to keep Ipswich off the black list till June at least'. I have no room for more; and some remain to be listed with the money received in April. Below are the groups of stand-in, steady money and other contributions actually received in March, which reach the not unsatisfactory total of

£46 4s. 0d.

Stand in money came from 'Exeter' standing in for Aberdeen, Birmingham, Swansea, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Turton (Lancs.), Ilfracombe, Norwich and Weymouth, 8s; D. Mayo, standing in for Plymouth and Rottingdean, 2s; 'Bristol', standing in for Gloucester, 1s.

Steady money guarantees came from:
R.J.R., Ipswich, 1s; 'Manchester', 1s; J. Tuckett, 1s 6d; Anon., Whitchurch, 1s; 'Leicester', 5s; 'Exeter' 2s; C.B., Bristol, 1s 6d; D. Mayo, £1 10s; H.G.B., 4s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; D. Rees, 10s; D. M. Clarke, 10s; H. N. Humphreys, 3s 6d; Royston Green, 3s 6d; Thos. H. Coe, 4s; H. Willcox, 2s; 'L'Humanité, 3s; T. Flood, 5s; H.S.M., 2s 6d; L. Rowan, 6s; S. Mill, £1; R.F.B., £3; T.W.R., £1; R. McLeod, 5s; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 5s; O. Greene, £2; S. Morrissy, 10s; H. Tinkler, 5s; F. Renouf, 5s; Director, £4; Socialist Sailor, £1; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. Purton, 7s 6d; D.M., 6s. Other contributions include:

Anon. I, 8s; J. Edwards, 1s; H. Wood, 8s; E. E. Cripps, 8s; G.M.B., 8s; L. R. Borsley, 8s; F. E. Carr, 8s; J.H. (Australia), 2s; R. H. Baker, 8s; P. Evans, 8s; C. C. J. Buttin, 5s; W. Jackson, 1s; N. Dodsworth, 8s; 'Overseas' £6 17s; T. Wilson, 8s; S. Datta, 8s; B. W. H. Goldbloom, 8s; W. S. Taylor, 5s; E. Tuckman, 7s 6d; D.N.L., 4s; R. W. H. Edwards, 8s; Anon. II, 4s; C. Dodsworth, 8s; M.N.T., 18s; 'A Surrey Reader', 10s; A. Borsdorf, 8s; J. Clifford, 3s; K. Jones, 4s; C. Walker, 3s; G.H.M. (Canada), 5s; A. S. Walker, 8s; B. Lawson, 8s; W. Monerieff, 8s; G.M. (U.S.A.), 17s 6d; L.R. (U.S.A.), £1 10s 4d; H.G.S. (Canada), £1 11s 8d; N.P.G. (U.S.A.), 14s; T.V.G., (U.S.A.), £2 9s; P.V.P. (U.S.A.), 14s; M.M. (Portugal), 5s.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW CHINA'S 'COMMON PROGRAMME'

Full Text, **Price 3d.**

from

Central Books, 2 Parton Street, London, W.C.1.

OF LASTING VALUE

(1) There ARE no Aryans, by R. Page Arnot.
Race Theories exposed.
Price 6d.

(2) The Political Foundations of Karl Marx, by Roy Pascal.
An original study.
Price 1s.

From The Manager,
"Labour Monthly",
134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

Studies in European Realism

by

Georg Lukacs

A brilliant analysis by a famous Marxist author of the writings of **Balzac, Stendhal, Zola, Tolstoy, Bielinsky, Chernishevsky, Dobrolyubov** and **Gorky**

288pp. Demy8vo., 21s.

HILLWAY PUBLISHING CO., 5 Hillway, London, N.6

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

I wish to become a postal subscriber to LABOUR MONTHLY and enclose 12/- (Home)
_____ to cover twelve months' subscription beginning with the 13/- (Abroad)

.....issue.

NAME .....
(Please use Block Capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED